

2004, the House had a vote on S. 714, legislation that would authorize the Bureau of Land Management to convey land to Douglas County, OR. On House rollcall vote No. 27, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING CLARK KERR

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 2004

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the man who created the blueprint for public higher education in the United States, Clark Kerr. On December 1, 2003, Mr. Kerr passed away at the age of 92 in El Cerrito, California. The 9th Congressional District salutes and thanks him for his tireless and spirited service.

As the most distinguished American academic administrator of his day, and the man who introduced free university tuition in California, Clark Kerr was known as the Henry Ford of higher education. His nine-year tenure as president of the University of California in the 1960s, and his earlier chancellorship of the Berkeley campus (1952–58), set the standard for American universities.

After being elected governor in 1967, Ronald Reagan slashed the UC budget by 10 percent and threatened to bring in tuition fees. Kerr demurred, and was denounced as a sympathizer. Following an illegal harassment campaign conducted by the CIA and the FBI, the Board of Regents was persuaded to vote 14–8 for Kerr's dismissal. Yet he was never bitter, and the student uproar at Berkeley raged on after his departure.

Although offered posts at Harvard and Stanford universities, Kerr chose instead to head the Carnegie commission on higher education, where he produced a series of publications covering every aspect of higher education. These continue to be essential reading for educators, but when he left in 1980, the institution closed. Without Kerr, apparently, it was inoperable.

Kerr's earlier master plan for Californian higher education had a big impact across the U.S. and brought him renown abroad.

It established three tuition-free tiers: community colleges offering two-year courses; state colleges open to the top third of high school graduates and granting bachelor's and master's degrees; and the UC system, taking the top eighth of students and able to award doctorates.

The plan became law in April 1960, immediately making California a leader in American higher education, and earning Kerr praise for "mass-producing low-cost quality education and research potential for a nation that hungered deeply for both". Later, while at the Carnegie commission, he moderated his views on free tuition, reflecting that "a very high proportion of students at UC came from upper-income families. This was a free ride for the well-to-do. I now think it is better to charge a moderate level of tuition and have a strong program of financial aid for those who can't afford it." In 1972, Congress translated this financial aid program into the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant, later known as Pell Grants.

Kerr's years as UC president coincided with some of the most tumultuous periods of stu-

dent protests. In 1961, he responded to complaints that a communist was speaking to Berkeley students by declaring that "the university is not engaged in making ideas safe for students. It is engaged in making students safe for ideas." As the protests became increasingly bitter, however, he found himself caught between liberal students and conservative politicians.

Kerr was born May 17, 1911 in Pennsylvania, the son of an apple farmer and a milliner, who imbued their son with a deep respect for education. His father was the first member of his family to go to university and spoke four languages; his mother had left school at 12 but postponed getting married until she had saved enough money to fund a college education for her future children. Kerr graduated from Swarthmore College, where he was president of the student union. He also became a Quaker. He took an MA in economics at Stanford, and transferred to Berkeley for his PhD before entering the new field of labor economics. He taught for a bit at the London School of Economics and at Stanford, and then went into labor negotiating, completing 500 settlements up and down the West Coast. He would later emphasize negotiating skills as essential for leading faction-racked universities.

Kerr returned to Berkeley as an academic in 1945, as many ex-service personnel were entering higher education thanks to the GI bill. As the cold war gathered momentum, the UC Regents demanded that all professors sign a loyalty oath, and this controversy changed Kerr's life. He became a powerful advocate of faculty views and, in 1952, his peers successfully recommended him for chancellor. During his Berkeley leadership, he added eight new residence halls and expanded the faculty.

As head of the entire UC system, he doubled the number of students, broadened three specialized campuses and added three new ones—at San Diego, Irvine and Santa Cruz—bringing the total to nine. He also wrote *The Uses of the University* (1963), which developed the idea of the modern research institution as what Kerr called the "multiversity". Two volumes of memoirs appeared in 2001 and earlier this year.

Catherine, his wife of 69 years, survives him, as do two sons and a daughter. Finally, as we honor Mr. Kerr today, I want to thank him for being a noble visionary and humanitarian. I take great pride in joining Clark's family, friends and colleagues to recognize and celebrate the accomplishments and contributions of Clark Kerr.

IN SUPPORT OF TAIWAN'S MARCH 20, 2004 REFERENDUM

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 2004

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Taiwanese government's decision to hold a referendum on March 20, 2004, thus allowing their citizens to exhibit a true expression of democracy. It is clearly in the best interests of the United States to promote the spread of democracy, and to defend democracy wherever it exists, and I therefore urge my colleagues as well as the current Ad-

ministration to support Taiwan's right to hold this referendum free from intimidation or threat of force from any nation.

In 2001, President Bush declared that America would do whatever it takes to defend Taiwan. Now it is time for us to act on this promise, not by a show of military force but by a show of vocal support for Taiwan's desire to express its democratic form of government. On March 20, 2004, Taiwan plans to hold a referendum to ask voters two questions on governmental relations with the PRC. First, Taiwanese citizens will be asked if they agree that their government should acquire more advanced anti-missile weapons to strengthen Taiwan's self-defense capabilities if the PRC refuses to remove the missiles it currently has targeting Taiwan. Second, they will be asked if they are in favor of negotiations with the PRC to reach a peaceful resolution to cross-strait differences. The people of Taiwan, and not the Government of the People's Republic of China, should have the sole right and responsibility for determining the future of Taiwan. Within this right of self-determination for the Taiwanese people lies the undeniable right of the Taiwanese government to hold referenda votes, when necessary, to assist the government in making key decisions that will effect the lives of their constituency.

As a democracy, Taiwan has shown great promise. Over the past decades, Taiwan has gone from having a one-party, martial law dictatorship to a growing democracy that has shown great respect for human rights and freedoms. It has also become a strong ally of the United States as well as a stabilizing democratic force in the Asian Pacific region. Now, Taiwan is in need of American assistance to preserve and defend the democratic form of government that it has worked so hard to create.

President Woodrow Wilson once said, "Just what is it that America stands for? If she stands for one thing more than another it is for the sovereignty of self-governing people." Mr. Speaker, as the foremost promoter of democracy and a country that stands for the sovereignty of the people, the United States cannot allow the collective voice of the Taiwanese people to be muffled due to intimidation from the People's Republic of China. It is the right of the Taiwanese people to be the sovereign rulers of their fate. I urge my colleagues and the administration to support this right as well as the growth of democracy in Taiwan.

INTRODUCING A BILL TO PROHIBIT THE COMPARATIVE COST ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM FROM OPERATING IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 2004

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that will prohibit the comparative cost adjustment program, as included in the recently passed Medicare bill, from operating in the State of Florida. My bill serves as a companion to legislation introduced last week by Florida's two Senators BOB GRAHAM and BILL NELSON. I am pleased that this legislation enjoys the full support of every Democrat in Florida's Congressional delegation.

The recently passed Medicare law requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish six premium support demonstration projects. These demonstration projects, sometimes referred to as comparative cost adjustment, must be established in 2010 and run through 2015. When established, they will essentially allow insurance companies to set the cost of prescription drugs provided for under Medicare at different levels throughout these six areas dependent upon geographic location, the density of those participating in the plan, and average age of those living in a given region. The selection criteria of the program make it likely that Florida would be one of the six selected sites.

A recent analysis done by Bush Administration actuaries last August confirmed that the "premium support" proposal originally included in the House Medicare bill would lead to higher fee-for-service premiums. That is, seniors and individuals with disabilities would have to spend more to remain in traditional Medicare.

Further, according to the Administration, within Florida, if premium support were enacted in Broward, Palm Beach, Miami-Dade, Brevard, Flagler, Hernando, Hillsborough, Indian River, Pasco, Pinellas, Seminole, or Volusia counties, premiums would increase for seniors in these counties wanting to remain in traditional Medicare. Realize, not all Florida counties were analyzed, and premium increases would be possible in other counties as well.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the President's flawed Medicare bill, for the first time in history, Medicare beneficiaries living in different parts of the country and even within the same State would face different premiums. These wide variations in premiums do not exist in traditional Medicare today.

For Medicare's almost 40-year history, seniors and individuals with disabilities in traditional Medicare have paid the same premium, no matter where they live. Premium support would end this uniformity and exacerbate existing concerns about geographic inequity in Medicare.

Although premium support is possible in counties with managed care, seniors and individuals with disabilities in counties without managed care are not off the hook. That is because there are several provisions in the Medicare bill that are designed to encourage managed care companies to enter new areas. If those provisions are successful—and given the enormous amounts of money devoted to encouraging companies to enter new areas, they undoubtedly will be—even seniors in counties currently without managed care could be forced to pay more to remain in traditional Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, in its nearly 37-year history, Medicare has provided millions of American seniors with important health protections. With more than 34 percent of the people living in the district which I represent over the age of 55, Medicare is a critical tool in improving the lives of so many.

However, under current law, seniors in my district may find themselves paying more for prescription drugs than those living in a neighboring county. This is completely unacceptable. My constituents do not wish to be guinea pigs for a prescription drug plan that pits their well being against the pocketbooks of pharmaceutical executives. My constituents expect to pay fair and honest prices for their prescription

drugs. They expect to pay the same amount for their prescriptions as seniors in California, New York, and every other State in the Union. Even more, they expect to pay the same amount as other seniors in Florida. Current law provides no such guarantee to Florida seniors, and that is completely unacceptable.

My legislation fairly addresses this shortfall and ensures that Florida seniors do not fall victim to vicious Republican efforts to privatize Medicare.

I urge the House Leadership to bring my bill to the House floor for its immediate consideration, and I ask for my colleagues' support.

BISHOP MUNIB YOUNAN ADDRESS- ES CONGRESS ON THE PROS- PECTS FOR ISRAELI-PALES- TINIAN PEACE

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 2004

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I recently traveled to Israel and the West Bank on a trip sponsored by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. It was one of the busiest, most exciting, and thought-provoking weeks of my life, and it added immeasurably to my understanding of the complexities and challenges of Israeli and Palestinian life.

During this trip, I had the good fortune to spend a great deal of time with Bishop Dr. Munib A. Younan, the Lutheran Bishop in Jerusalem. I was not only blessed by Bishop Younan's extraordinary hospitality, but benefited so much from his intimate knowledge of the region, the issues, and the key players on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, Bishop Younan came to Capitol Hill for a discussion with several Members and staffers. It was indeed a compelling conversation. Since not all of my colleagues were able to meet the Bishop personally, I would like to publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of his remarks. I look forward to continuing to work with all of my colleagues on the critical imperative to bring the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to an end.

Dear Friends: Good afternoon. It is an honor and a privilege for me to be here. I am going to talk about peace building and reconciliation in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. I will do so from a Palestinian Christian perspective.

I am a Palestinian and a Christian, and I happen to be a Lutheran. My home is in Jerusalem. We Palestinian Christians have lived in the Holy Land since the very beginning of Christianity.

Today we Christians are not as many as we used to be, due to emigration. But nevertheless we Christians are an integral segment of the Palestinian people. My family became refugees in the 1948 war. I still carry a United Nations-issued refugee card. I wonder if I had grown up in the difficult circumstances of a refugee camp in Bethlehem, Jenin, Nablus or Ramallah and if the Lutheran Church had not embraced me and my family in Jerusalem, if I ever would have had the opportunity to serve the church as a pastor or a bishop.

Sometimes, I am asked what is the role of the Church in the midst of such an unjust and destructive situation? I believe the Church is called to be prophetic. That means the Church is to stand for justice, con-

demning every kind of injustice, spiral violence or oppression whoever the perpetrator may be. But at the same time, the Palestinian Church has a vision for justice and peace. This prophetic role emanates from Prophet Micah who taught us: "God has told you, O mortal, what is good, and what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God." (Micah 6:8)

I wish to mention three particular circumstances of injustice:

(1) The Separation Wall being built by Israel.

The Separation Wall is intended to separate Israelis from Palestinians and is said to be a "security wall" for Israelis. I would submit to you that this wall is bound to create more hatred, more anger and more outrage because of the enormous losses and suffering it is creating among the Palestinian people. In my own Lutheran synod we are finding our people, pastors and churches being torn apart, separated by the Wall. The members of the Lutheran Church of the Redeemer in the Old City of Jerusalem and other Christians will find half of their congregations on one side and half on the other if the wall is built through a northern area of Jerusalem as is proposed. In Beit Sahour, 110 Palestinian Christian families are threatened to lose their houses because they happen to be near the separation wall that will be built. The Catholic bishops from the U.S.A. and Europe issued a statement on the 16th of January 2004 after their visit to Jerusalem by saying: "We have seen the devastating effect of the wall currently being built through the land and homes of Palestinian communities. This appears to be a permanent structure dividing families, isolating them from their farmland and their livelihoods, and cutting off religious institutions." His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, has said that "the Holy Land does not need walls, but bridges." We long in the Holy Land for bridges rather than walls!

The separation wall diminishes the hope held by Palestinians and Israelis that a negotiated solution resulting in two states, side by side, living in peace, is possible. The wall undermines the viability of a two state solution.

(2) A rapidly declining Palestinian economy.

The World Bank notes that 70 percent of Palestinians living under the military occupation are unemployed. And 65 percent of the population is living under the poverty line of \$2.00 USD per day. Another statistic recently released shows that the average per capita income of Palestinians is under \$1500.00, while the average per capita income of Israelis is more than \$18,000.00, again according to the World Bank. As you can imagine, this impoverishment has created major health and nutrition crises, as well as shattering the dignity of people and severely damaging the family unit and the whole society. The poverty has a devastating impact on our daily lives, but also undermines our hope for the future and reconciliation.

(3) Increasing isolation of Palestinian people in their towns and cities.

Most of our Palestinian cities and villages have become under siege. People are forced to remain within their town, hemmed in by checkpoints, roadblocks, tanks, armaments and Israeli Defense Force (IDF) soldiers and now, increasingly, by the Separation Wall. Recently we have begun hearing that any foreign visitors or workers in Israel must apply for a permit to enter the West Bank, something that has been done in regard to the Gaza Strip for sometime. Such permits, even if issued, will severely limit the people who come into the Palestinian towns and villages to help people and churches. I would